arXiv:hep-th/9301111v1 26 Jan 1993

On Foundation of the Generalized Nambu Mechanics (Second Version)

Leon Takhtajan
Department of Mathematics
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-3651

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We outline basic principles of canonical formalism for the Nambu mechanics—a generalization of Hamiltonian mechanics proposed by Yoichiro Nambu in 1973. It is based on the notion of Nambu bracket, which generalizes the Poisson bracket—a "binary" operation on classical observables on the phase space, to the "multiple" operation of higher order $n \geq 3$. Nambu dynamics is described by the phase flow given by Nambu-Hamilton equations of motion—a system of ODE's which involves $n-1$ "Hamiltonians". We introduce the fundamental identity for the Nambu bracket—a generalization of the Jacobi identity, as a consistency condition for the dynamics. We show that Nambu bracket structure defines an hierarchy of infinite families of "subordinated" structures of lower order, including Poisson bracket structure, which satisfy certain matching conditions. The notion of Nambu bracket enables to define Nambu-Poisson manifolds—phase spaces for the Nambu mechanics, which turn out to be more 'rigid" than Poisson manifolds—phase spaces for the Hamiltonian mechanics. We introduce the analog of the action form and the action principle for the Nambu mechanics. In its formulation dynamics of loops ($n-2$-dimensional chains for the general n-ary case) naturally appears. We discuss several approaches to the quantization of

Nambu mechanics, based on the deformation theory, path integral formulation and on Nambu-Heisenberg "commutation" relations. In the latter formalism we present explicit representation of Nambu-Heisenberg relation in the $n = 3$ case. We emphasize the role ternary and higher order algebraic operations, and mathematical structures related to them, play in passing from Hamilton's to Nambu's dynamical picture.

1 Introduction

In 1973 Nambu proposed a profound generalization of classical Hamiltonian mechanics [1]. In his formulation a triple (or, more generally, n-tuple) of "canonical" variables replaces a canonically conjugated pair in the Hamiltonian formalism and ternary (or, more generally, n-ary) operation—the Nambu bracket—replaces the usual Poisson bracket. Dynamics, according to Nambu, is determined by Nambu-Hamilton equations of motion, which use two (or, more generally, $n-1$) "Hamiltonians" and replace canonical Hamilton equations. Corresponding phase flow preserves the phase volume so that the analog of the Liouville theorem is still valid, which is fundamental for the formulation of statistical mechanics [1].

Nambu's proposal was partially analyzed in papers [2, 3]. In [2] it was shown that particular example of Nambu mechanics can be treated as a six-dimensional degenerate Hamiltonian system with three constraints and a Lagrangian being linear in velocities. In [3] it was shown that one can use a four-dimensional phase space as well. However, until recently, there were no attempts to formulate the basic principles of Nambu mechanics in the invariant geometrical form similar to that of Hamiltonian mechanics [5]. In this paper we develop the basics of such formalism and display novel mathematical structures which might have physical significance.

We start by formulating the fundamental identity (FI) for the Nambu bracket as a consistency condition for the Nambu's dynamics. As a corollary, it yields the analog of the Poisson theorem that Poisson bracket of integrals of motion is again an integral of motion. Based on FI, we introduce the notion of Nambu-Poisson manifolds, which play the same role in Nambu mechanics that Poisson manifolds play in Hamiltonian mechanics.

We show that Nambu bracket structure contains an infinite family of "subordinated" Nambu structures of lower degree, including Poisson bracket structure, with certain matching

conditions. This implies that Nambu bracket structure is, in a certain sense, more "rigid" then the Poisson bracket structure. It can be seen explicitly by showing that FI imposes rather strong constraints on possible forms of Nambu bracket. In addition to quadratic differential equations, it also introduces an overdetermined system of quadratic algebraic equations for the Nambu bracket tensor. This is the novel feature in comparison with the Poisson bracket case, where we have differential constraints only. Additional algebraic requirements are "responsible" for the above-mentioned "rigidity" of the Nambu bracket structure in comparison with the Poisson bracket structure. Specifically, whereas any skew-symmetric constant 2-tensor yields a Poisson bracket, this is no longer true for the Nambu bracket. This manifests rather special nature of Nambu mechanics. From our point of view such exclusiveness should be considered as an advantage of the theory rather then of the contrary.

Next, we develop canonical formalism for the Nambu mechanics. It is based on the analog of Poincaré-Cartan integral invariant—action form, which is a differential form of degree $n-1$ on the extended phase space. It has properties similar to those of the usual Poincaré-Cartan invariant and enables us to formulate principle of least action for Nambu mechanics. Instead of all possible "histories" of the Hamiltonian system considered in action principle for classical mechanics (all paths connecting initial and final points in the configuration space), in Nambu mechanics one should consider all $n-1$-chains in the extended phase space whose "time-slices" are closed $n-2$-chains satisfying certain boundary conditions. We define classical action as an integral of generalized Poincaré-Cartan invariant over such $n-1$-chains and prove the principle of least action: "world-sheets" of a given $n-2$-chains under the Nambu-Hamilton phase flow are extremals of the action.

Finally, we briefly discuss quantization of Nambu mechanics. This problem, first considered by Nambu [1], is still outstanding. We indicate several possible approaches towards its solution. In particular, we construct a special representation of Nambu-Heisenberg "commutation" relations, which is similar in spirit to the representation of canonical Heisenberg commutation relations by creation-annihilation operators in the space of states of the harmonic oscillator. In our realization states are parametrized by a lattice of algebraic integers in a cyclotomic field for the cubic root of unity, whereas states of the harmonic oscillator are parametrized by non-negative rational integers.

Now let us explain the main ideas of the paper in more detail. We start with the

simplest phase space for Hamiltonian mechanics— a two-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^2$ with coordinates x, y and canonical Poisson bracket

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial(f_1, f_2)}{\partial(x, y)}.$$

This bracket satisfies Jacobi identity

$$\{f_1, \{f_2, f_3\}\} + \{f_3, \{f_1, f_2\}\} + \{f_2, \{f_3, f_1\}\} = 0,$$

and gives rise to a Hamilton's equations of motion

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \{H, f\},$$

where f is a classical observable—a smooth function on the phase space—and H is a Hamiltonian.

Generalization of this example leads to a concept of Poisson manifolds— smooth manifolds endowned with a Poisson bracket structure satisfying skew-symmetry condition, Leibniz rule and Jacobi identity.

Canonical Nambu bracket [1] is defined for a triple of classical observables on the three-dimensional phase space $\mathbb{R}^3$ with coordinates x, y, z by the following beautiful formula

$$\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = \frac{\partial(f_1, f_2, f_3)}{\partial(x, y, z)},$$

where the right-hand side stands for the Jacobian of the mapping $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3) : \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$. This formula naturally generalizes usual Poisson bracket from binary to ternary operation on classical observables.[1] Generalized Nambu-Hamilton equations of motion involve two "Hamiltonians" H_1 and H_2 and have the form

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \{H_1, H_2, f\}.$$

Corresponding phase flow on the phase space is divergence-free and preserves the standard volume form $dx \wedge dy \wedge dz$ – analog of the Liouville theorem for Nambu mechanics [1].

In Section 2 we prove that canonical Nambu bracket satisfies the following fundamental identity (and its generalizations for the n-ary case)[2]

$$\{\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}, f_4, f_5\} + \{f_3, \{f_1, f_2, f_4\}, f_5\} + \{f_3, f_4, \{f_1, f_2, f_5\}\} = \{f_1, f_2, \{f_3, f_4, f_5\}\}.$$

[1] M. Flato [6] informed me that, apparently, Nambu introduced this bracket in order to develop a "toy model" for quarks considered as triples.

[2] This relation was also independently introduced by F. Bayen and M. Flato [7].

This formula might have been considered as the most natural (at least from a "dynamical" point of view) generalization of the Jacobi identity. It yields (see Theorem 3) an analog of classical Poisson theorem that Poisson bracket of two integrals of motion is again an integral of motion. Generalized version of FI for the n-ry case (where Jacobian of the mapping $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ defines canonical Nambu bracket of order n) enables us to introduce Nambu-Poisson manifolds as a smooth manifolds with Nambu bracket structure— an n-ary operation on classical observables satisfying skew-symmetry condition, Leibniz rule and FI. We show that by fixing some of the arguments in the Nambu bracket of order n one can get brackets of lower order which still satisfy fundamental identity (i.e. are Nambu brackets) and, in addition, satisfy certain matching conditions for different choices of fixed arguments. This hierarchical structure of Nambu bracket shows that it is more "rigid" concept yen that of Poisson bracket. We discuss explicit conditions FI imposes on corresponding n-tensor of the Nambu bracket. We show, contrary to the Poisson case, that algebraic part of FI substantially reduces possible Nambu structures with constant skew-symmetric n-tensor. Specifically, we show that bracket on the phase space $\mathbb{R}^{3n} = \oplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{R}^3$, defined in [1] (and used in [4]) as a direct sum of canonical Nambu brackets on $\mathbb{R}^3$, does not satisfy FI and, therefore, is not a Nambu bracket. Next, we discuss linear Nambu brackets. We show that they naturally lead to a new notion of Nambu-Lie "gebras", which generalizes Lie algebras for the n-ary case. We close Section 2 by presenting several simple examples of evolution equations which admit Nambu formulation.

In Section 3 we introduce the analog of Poincaré-Cartan integral invariant for Nambu mechanics—a differential form of degree $n-1$ on the extended phase space. In the simplest three-dimensional example described above it is given by the following 2-form on $\mathbb{R}^4$

$$\omega^{(2)} = xdy \wedge dz - H_1 dH_2 \wedge dt.$$

We prove in Theorem 6 that the vector field of Nambu-Hamilton phase flow in the extended phase space is the line field of the 3-form $d\omega^{(2)}$, so that integral curves are its characteristics. We define a classical action as an integral of Poincaré-Cartan action form over $n-1$-chains, and in Theorem 7 prove the principle of least action. It states that $n-1$-chains—"tubes" of integral curves of Nambu-Hamilton phase flow "passing through" a given $n-2$-chains—are the extremals of the action. These results generalize the basic facts lying the foundation of Hamiltonian mechanics (see, e.g., [5]).

In Section 4 we discuss possible approaches to the quantization of Nambu mechanics. Though we mention those based on the deformation theory and Feynmann path integral, our main result is the explicit construction of a special representation of Nambu-Heisenberg commutation relation. For the ternary case this relation has the form (see [1])

$$[A_1, A_2, A_3] = A_1A_2A_3 - A_1A_3A_2 + A_3A_1A_2 - A_3A_2A_1 + A_2A_3A_1 - A_2A_1A_3 = cI,$$

where A_1, A_2, A_3 are linear operators, I is a unit operator and c is a constant. Let $\mathbf{Z}[\rho]$ be a lattice of algebraic integers in quadratic number field $\mathbf{Q}[\rho]$, where $\rho^3 = 1$. We prove in Theorem 8 that Nambu-Heisenberg relation can be represented by operators A_i acting in the linear space $\mathbf{H} = \{|\omega\rangle,\ \omega \in \mathbf{Z}[\rho]\}$ by the following simple formula

$$A_1|\omega\rangle = (\omega + 1 + \rho)|\omega + 1\rangle,\ A_2|\omega\rangle = (\omega + \rho)|\omega + \rho\rangle,\ A_3|\omega\rangle = \omega|\omega + \rho^2\rangle.$$

This realization should be compared with canonical representation of Heisenberg commutation relations in the space of states of harmonic oscillator given by creation-annihilation operators. Contrary to the latter case, our representation does not have a vacuum vector (at least in the conventional sense) and we do not know whether the analog of Stone-von Neumann theorem (unitary equivalence of irreducible representations) is still true.

Acknowledgments. I appreciate stimulating conversations and discussions with Moshe Flato, Igor Krichever, Nicolai Reshetikhin, Han Sah and Daniel Sternheimer. I am grateful to Larry Lambe for performing symbolic computations in connection with a system of quadratic algebraic equations described in Section 2. I should also mention that Theorem 8 was obtained as early as in 1977. Its publication was deliberately postponed since at that time it did not "fit" into a general picture.

This work was partially supported by the Paul and Gabriella Rosenbaum Foundation.

2 Nambu-Poisson Manifolds

In Hamiltonian mechanics a smooth manifold X is called a *Poisson manifold* and its function ring $A = C^\infty(X)$—*algebra of observables,* if there exists a map $\{\ ,\ \} : A \otimes A \mapsto A$ with the following properties.

1. Skew-symmetry

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = -\{f_2, f_1\},$$

for all $f_1, f_2 \in A$.

2. Leibniz rule (derivation property)

$$\{f_1 f_2, f_3\} = f_1\{f_2, f_3\} + f_2\{f_1, f_3\}.$$

3. Jacobi identity

$$\{f_1, \{f_2, f_3\}\} + \{f_3, \{f_1, f_2\}\} + \{f_2, \{f_3, f_1\}\} = 0,$$

for all $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in A$.

Corresponding "binary operation" $\{\ ,\ \}$ on A is called *Poisson bracket* and plays a fundamental role in classical mechanics. Namely, according to Hamilton, dynamics on the *phase space* X is determined by a distinguished function $H \in A$—a *Hamiltonian*, and is described by Hamilton's equations of motion

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \{H, f\}, \quad f \in A.$$

When solution to Hamilton's equations exists for all times $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and all initial data (this is so when X is compact), it defines Hamilton phase flow $x \mapsto g^t(x),\ x \in X$, and evolution operator $U_t : A \mapsto A$,

$$U_t(f)(x) = f(g^t(x)),\ x \in X,\ f \in A.$$

Hamilton's dynamical picture is consistent if and only if evolution operator U_t is an isomorphism of algebra of observables A. This means that U_t is an algebra isomorphism, i.e. $U_t(f_1 f_2) = U_t(f_1)U_t(f_2)$ and, in addition, preserves the Poisson structure on A, i.e. $U_t(\{f_1, f_2\}) = \{U_t(f_1), U_t(f_2)\}$. It is easy to see (using the standard uniqueness theorem for ODE's) that the first property is equivalent to the Leibniz rule and the second one is equivalent to the Jacobi identity. We summarize these well known results as the following theorem.

Theorem 1 *Evolution operator in Hamilton's dynamical picture is an isomorphism of algebra of observables $A = C^\infty(X)$ if and only if the phase space X is a Poisson manifold.*

The basic examples of Poisson manifolds are given by two-dimensional phase space $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ with coordinates x, y and Poisson bracket

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y} - \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x} = \frac{\partial(f_1, f_2)}{\partial(x, y)},$$

and by its generalization— $X = \mathbb{R}^{2N}$ with coordinates $x_1, \ldots, x_N, y_1, \ldots, y_N$ and Poisson bracket

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} (\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_i}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial y_i} - \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial y_i}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x_i}).$$

Geometrically, Poisson manifold X is characterized by a *Poisson tensor* η – a section of the exterior square $\wedge^2 TX$ of a tangent bundle TX of X, which defines Poisson structure by the formula

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \eta(df_1, df_2).$$

Jacobi identity is equivalent to the property that η has a vanishing Schouten bracket with itself. In local coordinates $(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ on X Poisson tensor η is given by

$$\eta = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \eta_{ij}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j},$$

and Jacobi identity identity takes the form

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} (\eta_{il}\frac{\partial \eta_{jk}}{\partial x_l} + \eta_{jl}\frac{\partial \eta_{ki}}{\partial x_l} + \eta_{kl}\frac{\partial \eta_{ij}}{\partial x_l}) = 0,$$

for all $i, j, k = 1, \ldots, N$.

Dynamics according to Nambu consists in replacing Poisson bracket by a ternary (n-ary) operation on algebra of observables A and requires two $(n-1)$ "Hamiltonians" H_1, H_2 $(H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1})$ to describe the evolution. This dynamical picture is consistent if and only if evolution operator is an isomorphism of algebra of observables. Therefore, we propose the following definition.

Definition 1 Manifold X is called a *Nambu-Poisson manifold* of order n if there exists a map $\{, \ldots, \} : A^{\otimes^n} \mapsto A$—generalized *Nambu bracket* of order n, satisfying the following properties.

1. Skew-symmetry

$$\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\} = (-1)^{\epsilon(\sigma)}\{f_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, f_{\sigma(n)}\},$$

for all $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in A$ and $\sigma \in Symm(n)$, where $Symm(n)$ is a symmetric group of n elements and $\epsilon(\sigma)$ is the parity of a permutation σ.

2. Leibniz rule

$$\{f_1 f_2, f_3, \ldots, f_{n+1}\} = f_1\{f_2, f_3, \ldots, f_{n+1}\} + f_2\{f_1, f_3, \ldots, f_{n+1}\},$$

for all $f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1} \in A$.

3. Fundamental identity (FI)

$$\{\{f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, f_n\}, f_{n+1}, \ldots, f_{2n-1}\} + \{f_n, \{f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, f_{n+1}\}, f_{n+2}, \ldots, f_{2n-1}\}$$
$$+ \ldots + \{f_n, \ldots, f_{2n-2}, \{f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, f_{2n-1}\}\} = \{f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, \{f_n, \ldots, f_{2n-1}\}\},$$

for all $f_1, \ldots, f_{2n-1} \in A$.

Remark 1 Nambu bracket structure of order n on a phase space X induces infinite family of "subordinated" Nambu structures of orders $n-1$ and lower, including the family of Poisson structures. Indeed, consider $n = 3$ case and for $H \in A$ define the bracket $\{\ ,\ \}_H$ on X as

$$\{\psi, \phi\}_H = \{H, \psi, \phi\}$$

for all $\psi, \phi \in A$. Setting in FI $f_1 = f_3 = H$, we see that it turns into the Jacobi identity for the family of brackets $\{\ ,\ \}_H$ parametrized by observables H. Conversely, such family of Poisson brackets gives rise to Nambu bracket if certain matching conditions are satisfied. Namely, for any $\phi \in A$ define

$$D^H_\phi(f) = \{\phi, f\}_H,\ \ f \in A,$$

which is the derivation of the Poisson bracket $\{,\ ,\ \}_H$ (Jacobi identity). Then the family $\{\ ,\ \}_H,\ H \in A$ of Poisson brackets on X gives rize to a Nambu bracket, defined as

$$\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = \{f_2, f_3\}_{f_1},$$

if and only if

$$D^{H_1}_\phi(\{\psi, \chi\}_{H_2}) = \{D^{H_1}_\phi(\psi), \chi\}_{H_2} + \{\psi, D^{H_1}_\phi(\chi)\}_{H_2} + \{\psi, \chi\}_{D^{H_1}_\phi(H_2)},\ \ \phi, \psi, \chi \in A,$$

for all $H_1, H_2 \in A$. Indeed, it is easy to see that this equation—a derivation property of $D^{H_1}_\phi$ with respect to the whole family of Poisson brackets $\{\ ,\ \}_H$—is equivalent to FI (if one identifies $f_1 = H_1, f_2 = \phi, f_3 = \psi, f_4 = \chi$ and $f_5 = H_2$). Moreover, this condition for the case $H_1 = H_2 = H$ is equivalent to the Jacobi identity for the bracket $\{\ ,\ \}_H$. The same is true for the general case, where for all $H_1, \ldots H_{n-k} \in A$ the assignment

$$\{f_1, \ldots, f_k\}_{H_1 \ldots H_{n-k}} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_{n-k}, f_1, \ldots f_k\}$$

defines a hierarchy of subordinated Nambu structures of orders $k = 2, \ldots, n-1$, parametrized by the elements in $\wedge^{n-k}A$. They all satisfy FI (which follows from FI for the "basic" structure of order n) and matching conditions of the same type as above.

Dynamics on Nambu-Poisson manifold is determined by $n-1$ functions $H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ and is described by generalized Nambu-Hamilton equations of motion

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}, f\}, \ f \in A. \tag{1}$$

Corresponding Nambu-Hamilton phase flow g^t defines evolution operator U_t, $U_t(f)(x) = f(g^t x)$, $x \in X$, for all $f \in A$.

The following theorem clarifies "dynamical" meaning of a concept of Nambu-Poisson manifolds.

Theorem 2 *Evolution operator in Nambu's dynamical picture is an isomorphism of algebra of observables $A = C^\infty(X)$ if and only if the phase space X is a Nambu-Poisson manifold.*

Proof. We need to prove that

$$U_t(\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}) = \{U_t(f_1), \ldots, U_t(f_n)\}. \tag{2}$$

Since (2) is obviously valid at time $t = 0$, it sufficient to show that it both sides satisfy the same evolution differential equation. Denoting by $L \in Vect(X)$ the vector field of the Nambu-Hamilton flow g^t, i.e.

$$L(f) = \{H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}, f\},$$

we can express t-derivative of (2) as

$$L(\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}) = \{L(f_1), f_2, \ldots, f_n\} + \{f_1, L(f_2), \ldots, f_n\} + \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, L(f_n)\},$$

which is nothing but FI specialized for the functions $H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}, f_1, \ldots, f_n$. □

Remark 2 Equivalent formulation of FI used in the previous proof can be stated explicitly that for any elements $H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}$ the mapping $L : A \mapsto A$ is a derivation of the Nambu bracket.

Definition 2 Observable $F \in A$ is called *integral of motion* for Nambu-Hamilton system with Hamiltonians $H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}$, if

$$\{H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}, F\} = 0.$$

As an obvious corollary of FI we get the following result.

Theorem 3 *Nambu bracket of n integrals of motion is an integral of motion.*

Remark 3 As we have seen in Remark 1, Nambu bracket structure of order n contains an infinite family of subordinated structures of lower degree, including Poisson bracket structure, with matching conditions between them. Therefore one might suspect that Nambu structure should be more "rigid" then its Poisson counterpart. This can be seen by comparing FI of order n with Jacobi identity—its special case when $n = 2$. As we know, the left hand side of Jacobi identity, considered as a map from $A \otimes A \otimes A$ into A, is a deriviation with respect to every argument. However, for the general case $n \geq 3$ the difference between the left and right hand sides of FI, considered as a map from $2n-1$-fold tensor product $A \otimes \ldots \otimes A$ into A, is a derivation only with respect to the arguments $f_n, \ldots, f_{2n-1}$ and not to $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$. This is because these two groups appear in FI in a different way. Namely, analyzing FI, it is easy to see that observables from the first group appear only twice under the "double Nambu bracket", whereas there n such terms for every member in the second group[3]. Consider, for instance, such terms for the argument f_{2n-1}. Denoting by $L_{i_1 \ldots i_{n-1}}$ vector field corresponding to Nambu-Hamilton phase flow with Hamiltonians $f_{i_1}, \ldots, f_{i_{n-1}}$, we can arrange these terms as a commutator $[L_{n \ldots 2n-2}, L_{1 \ldots n-1}](f_{2n-1})$, so they are still given by a vector field action. This proves the derivation property with respect to the argument f_{2n-1} (cf. standard arguments in Hamiltonian mechanics [5]). Same arguments apply to all members of the second group, but not to those of the first group. As we shall see below, this feature of FI implies strong constraints on the possible forms of Nambu bracket.

Geometrically, Nambu structure of order n can be realized as

$$\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\} = \eta(df_1, \ldots, df_n),$$

where η is a section of the n-fold exterior power $\wedge^n TX$ of a tangent bundle TX. In local coordinates $(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ on X *Nambu tensor* η is given by

$$\eta = \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_n = 1}^{N} \eta_{i_1 \ldots i_n}(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_1}} \wedge \ldots \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{i_n}}$$

and should satisfy FI. As we mentioned earlier, FI implies strong constraints on n-tensor η.

[3] This is not surprising since, according to interpretation in Remark 2, members from the second group may be considered as a Hamiltonians for Nambu-Hamilton equations of motion, whereas members from the first group are "just" observables.

First, taking into the account Remark 3, we see that all terms containing second derivatives of $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$ should vanish. This results in the following system of quadratic algebraic equations

$$N_{ij} + P(N)_{ij} = 0, \tag{3}$$

for all multi-indices $i = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}$ and $j = \{j_1, \ldots, j_n\}$ from the set $\{1, \ldots, N\}$, where

$$N_{ij} = \eta_{i_1 \ldots i_n}\eta_{j_1 \ldots j_n} + \eta_{j_n i_1 i_3 \ldots i_n}\eta_{j_1 \ldots j_{n-1} i_2} + \ldots + \eta_{j_n i_2 \ldots i_{n-1} i_1}\eta_{j_1 \ldots j_{n-1} i_n} - \eta_{j_n i_2 \ldots i_n}\eta_{j_1 \ldots j_{n-1} i_1}. \tag{4}$$

and P is a permutation operator which interchanges first and $n+1$-th indices (i.e. i_1 and j_1) of a $2n$-tensor N.

Second, all terms containing first derivatives of $f_1, \ldots, f_{2n-1}$ must vanish. This yields the following system of quadratic differential equations

$$\sum_{l=1}^{N} (\eta_{l i_2 \ldots i_n} \frac{\partial \eta_{j_1 \ldots j_n}}{\partial x_l} + \eta_{j_n l i_3 \ldots i_n} \frac{\partial \eta_{j_1 \ldots j_{n-1} i_2}}{\partial x_l} + \ldots + \eta_{j_n i_2 \ldots i_{n-1} l} \frac{\partial \eta_{j_1 \ldots j_{n-1} i_n}}{\partial x_l}) = 0, \tag{5}$$

for all indices $i_2, \ldots, i_n, j_1, \ldots, j_n = 1, \ldots, N$.

Thus skew-symmetric n-tensor η defines Nambu bracket of order n if and only if it satisfies equations (3) – (5).

This shows significant difference between Nambu and Hamiltonian formulations—a constant skew-symmetric n-tensor η (which obviously satisfies (5)) for $n \geq 3$ no longer "automatically" defines Nambu bracket! To do so, it must satisfy algebraic constraints (3) – (4). One may wonder whether there are any solutions at all to the algebraic-differential system (3) – (5)?

The following geometric interpretation of tensor N provides the simplest examples. Let V be the N-dimensional linear space and V^* be its dual space. Any constant skew-symmetric n-tensor η can be interpreted as an element in the linear space $\wedge^n V$, which we also will denote by η. With every $\eta \in \wedge^n V$ one can associate a map $N : \wedge^{n-1} V^* \mapsto \wedge^{n+1} V$, defined by the formula

$$Na = i_a(\eta) \wedge \eta \in \wedge^{n+1} V,$$

for all $a \in \wedge^{n-1} V^*$. Here $i_a(\eta) \in V$ is given by $(i_a(\eta), v^*) = (\eta, a \wedge v^*)$ for any $v^* \in V^*$ and $(\ ,\ )$ stands for the pairing between V and V^*. It is well known that equation $N = 0$ is equivalent to the condition that element $\eta \in \wedge^n V$ is decomposable, i.e. there exist $v_1, \ldots v_n \in V$ such

that $\eta = v_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge v_n$, and it is easy to verify that in coordinates the map N is represented by the $2n$-tensor N given by formula (4).

Thus we have proved the following result.

Theorem 4 *Let V be a linear space. Any decomposable element in $\wedge^n V$ endows V with the structure of a Nambu-Poisson manifold of order n.*

In particular, consider Nambu's original example [1], when $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ is a phase space with coordinates $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and "canonical" Nambu bracket is given by

$$\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\} = \frac{\partial(f_1, \ldots, f_n)}{\partial(x_1, \ldots, x_n)}, \tag{6}$$

where the right-hand-side stands for the Jacobian of the mapping $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$. From Theorem 4 we get

Corollary *Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$ with canonical Nambu bracket of order n is a Nambu-Poisson manifold.*

Proof. Canonical Nambu bracket of order n is given by totally anti-symmetric n-tensor $\eta_{i_1 \ldots i_n} = \epsilon_{i_1 \ldots i_n}$, which corresponds to the volume element of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and, therefore, is decomposable. □

Remark 4 We define *canonical transformations* as a diffeomorphisms of the phase space which preserve Nambu bracket structure. For the Nambu's example linear canonical transformations form a group $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$.

Remark 5 In [1] Nambu also considered another example—"direct sum" of canonical brackets. In this case $X = \mathbb{R}^{3n} = \oplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{R}^3$ and the bracket is given by the following element

$$\eta = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge e_3 + e_4 \wedge e_5 \wedge e_6 + \ldots + e_{3n-2} \wedge e_{3n-1} \wedge e_{3n} \in \wedge^3 \mathbb{R}^{3n},$$

where $e_i,\ i = 1, \ldots, 3n$ is a basis in $\mathbb{R}^{3n}$ induced by a standard basis in $\mathbb{R}^3$. (This bracket was used in [4] to write equations of motion of a particle interacting with $SU(2)$ monopole). However, it is easy to see that such tensor η does not satisfy system (3) and, therefore, does not define Nambu bracket! This "explains" Nambu's observation [1] that linear canonical transformations for this bracket "decouple", i.e. form a direct product of n copies of $SL(3, \mathbb{R})$—a fact he considered to be rather disappointing.

To summarize this discussion, we see that there is significant difference between Nambu and Hamiltonian mechanics with Nambu formulation being "more rigid".

The problem of constructing other examples of Nambu-Poisson manifolds is of great importance. Not trying to address it here (but hoping to to return to it later on), we will mention a just a few.

Remark 6 It seems that in the constant case there should be other examples of Nambu brackets besides those given by decomposable tensors, since equations (3) do not immediately imply that $N = 0$[4].

Another class of examples is provided by a non-constant tensors η. As we know, linear Poisson bracket structure (Poisson structure on linear space such that Poisson bracket of linear functions is again linear) is equivalent to a Lie algebra structure on the dual space. One can ask what kind of structure does linear Nambu bracket introduce?

Definition 3 A vector space V is called *Nambu-Lie "gebra"* of order n if there exists a map—*Nambu-Lie bracket*—$[\ .,\dots,.\ ] : \wedge^n V \mapsto V$ such that

$$[[v_1,\dots,v_{n-1},v_n],v_{n+1},\dots,v_{2n-1}] + [v_n,[v_1,\dots,v_{n-1},v_{n+1}],v_{n+2},\dots,v_{2n-1}]$$
$$+\dots+[v_n,\dots,v_{2n-2},[v_1,\dots,v_{n-1},v_{2n-1}]] = [v_1,\dots,v_{n-1},[v_n,\dots,v_{2n-1}]],$$

for all $v_1,\dots,v_{2n-1} \in V$.

Remark 7 Definition of Nambu-Lie "gebras" can be stated in equivalent form as a condition that for any $v_1,\dots,v_{n-1} \in V$ "adjoint" map $[v_1,\dots,v_{n-1},\ ] : V \mapsto V$ is a derivation with respect to the Nambu-Lie bracket $[\ ,\dots,\ ]$.

Theorem 5 *Linear Nambu structures of order n are in one-to-one correspondence with Nambu-Lie "gebras" of order n on the dual space.*

Proof. Fundamental identity for linear functions is nothing but FI in the definition of Nambu-Lie "gebras". □

In coordinates, linear Nambu structure of order n is given by $n+1$-tensor $c^k_{i_1\dots i_n}$:

$$\{x_{i_1},\dots,x_{i_n}\} = \sum_{k=1}^{N} c^k_{i_1\dots i_n} x_k.$$

"Structure constants" $c^k_{i_1\dots i_n}$ satisfy overdetermined system of quadratic algebraic equations which follow from (3)—(5). We are planning to analyze this interesting structure elsewhere.

[4]Larry Lambe, using symbolic computations technique, present an explicit form of a Groebner basis of a polynomial ideal of all relations (3) in the case $n = 3,\ N = 6$. It follows from his analysis that in this case all solutions are represented by decomposable tensors.

Now we present several simple examples of dynamical systems which admit Nambu formulation.

Example 1 It goes back to Nambu [1] and is given by Euler equations for the angular momentum of a rigid body in three dimensions. These equations admit both Hamiltonian formulation with respect to the linear Poisson bracket on $\mathbb{R}^3 \cong su(2)^*$, where Hamiltonian is given by kinetic energy and Nambu formulation with respect to the canonical ternary Nambu bracket on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and two Hamiltonians – kinetic energy and total angular momentum.

Example 2 Lagrange system (sometimes called Nahm's system in the theory of static $SU(2)$-monopoles, see, e.g., [9, 10]) on $\mathbb{R}^3$, which is given by the following equations of motion

$$\frac{dx_1}{dt} = x_2x_3,\ \frac{dx_2}{dt} = x_1x_3,\ \frac{dx_3}{dt} = x_1x_2,$$

can be written in Nambu form

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \{H_1, H_2, x_i\},\ i = 1, 2, 3,$$

where $H_1 = x_1^2 - x_2^2,\ H_2 = x_1^2 - x_3^2$. Integrals H_1 and H_2 confine the phase flow to the intersection of two quadrics in $\mathbb{R}^3$ – a locus of an elliptic curve so that the system can be integrated by elliptic functions. There exists another system with quadratic nonlinearity—so-called Halphen system, which is related to the Lagrange system (see, e.g., [9, 10]). It can be integrated in terms of modular forms (see, e.g., [10]) and does not admit global (single-valued) integrals of motion. However, this system has two multi-valued integrals which play the role of two Hamiltonians in Nambu formulation [11].

Example 3 Let $X = \mathbb{R}^n$ be the phase space with canonical Nambu bracket of order n and let the elementary symmetric functions of n variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ to be the Hamiltonians:

$$H_1 = s_1, \ldots, H_{n-1} = s_{n-1},$$

where $(x - x_1)\ldots(x - x_n) = x^n - s_1x^{n-1}\ldots \pm s_n$. Nambu-Hamilton equations of motion

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1}, x_i\},\ i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

can be written as

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \frac{\partial^n f}{\partial x_i^n},\quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (x_i - x_j),$$

which might suggest a generalization of a gradient flows.

3 Canonical Formalism and Action Principle

Here we extend canonical formalism of Hamiltonian mechanics, based on Poincaré-Cartan integral invariant and on the principle of least action (see, e.g., [5]), to the case of Nambu mechanics. We illustrate essential features of our approach on the simplest example of Nambu-Poisson manifold $X = \mathbb{R}^3$ with canonical Nambu bracket.

Let $\tilde{X} = \mathbb{R}^4$ be the extended phase space with coordinates x, y, z, t.

Definition 4 The following 2-form $\omega^{(2)}$ on $\tilde{X}$

$$\omega^{(2)} = xdy \wedge dz - H_1 dH_2 \wedge dt, \tag{7}$$

is called *generalized Poincare-Cartan integral invariant—action form* for Nambu mechanics (cf. [5]).

Consider Nambu-Hamilton equations with Hamiltonians H_1 and H_2

$$\frac{df}{dt} = \{H_1, H_2, f\} = L(f),$$

where

$$L = L_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + L_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + L_3 \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \in Vect(X),$$

and

$$L_1 = \frac{\partial(H_1, H_2)}{\partial(y, z)},\ L_2 = \frac{\partial(H_1, H_2)}{\partial(z, x)},\ L_3 = \frac{\partial(H_1, H_2)}{\partial(x, y)}.$$

Denote by

$$\tilde{L} = L + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \in Vect(\tilde{X})$$

corresponding vector field on the extended phase space $\tilde{X}$.

Theorem 6 *Vector field $\tilde{L} \in Vect(\tilde{X})$ is a line field of the 3-form $d\omega^{(2)}$, i.e.*

$$i_{\tilde{L}}(d\omega^{(2)}) = 0.$$

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned} d\omega^{(2)} &= dx \wedge dy \wedge dz - dH_1 \wedge dH_2 \wedge dt \\ &= dx \wedge dy \wedge dz - L_3 dx \wedge dy \wedge dt + L_2 dx \wedge dz \wedge dt - L_1 dy \wedge dz \wedge dt, \end{aligned}$$

direct calculation (cf. [5]) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} i_{\tilde{L}}(d\omega^{(2)}) &= d\omega^{(2)}(\tilde{L},\ .\ ,\ .\ ) = L_1 dy \wedge dz - L_2 dx \wedge dz + L_3 dx \wedge dy \\ &- L_3(L_1 dy \wedge dt - L_2 dx \wedge dt) + L_2(L_1 dz \wedge dt - L_3 dx \wedge dt) \\ &- L_1(L_2 dz \wedge dt - L_3 dy \wedge dt) - L_3 dx \wedge dy + L_2 dx \wedge dz - L_1 dy \wedge dz = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

As in the case of Hamiltonian mechanics, this theorem has important corollary (cf. [5]). Namely, let c be a closed 2-chain in $\tilde{X}$, g^t be Nambu-Hamilton phase flow and 3-chain $J^t c = \{g^\tau c,\ 0 \leq \tau \leq t\}$ be a trace of the chain c under the isotopy g^τ.

Corollary

$$\int_c \omega^{(2)} = \int_{g^t(c)} \omega^{(2)}.$$

Proof. Using the formula $\partial(J^t c) = c - g^t(c)$, Stokes theorem and Theorem 6, we get

$$\int_c \omega^{(2)} - \int_{g^t(c)} \omega^{(2)} = \int_{J^t c} d\omega^{(2)} = 0.$$

□

Next we formulate the principle of least action. Recall that in Hamiltonian mechanics this principle states (see, e.g., [5]) that classical trajectory—integral curve γ of Hamilton's phase flow with initial and final points (p_0, q_0, t_0) and (p_1, q_1, t_1), is an extremal of the action functional

$$A(\gamma) = \int_\gamma (pdq - Hdt)$$

in the class of all paths connecting initial and final points in given n-dimensional subspaces $(t = t_0, q = q_0)$ and $(t = t_1, q = q_1)$ in the extended phase space.

Definition 5 The functional

$$A(C_2) = \int_{C_2} \omega^{(2)}$$

—integral of the action form over 2-chains in the extended phase space $\tilde{X}$, is called *action functional* for Nambu mechanics.

Let γ be a closed 1-chain in X. Define a 2-chain Γ in $\tilde{X}$ as a trace of γ under the isotopy $g^t,\ t_0 \le t \le t_1$, so that $\partial\Gamma = \gamma_{t_0} - \gamma_{t_1}$, where $\gamma_{t_0} = \gamma,\ \gamma_{t_1} = g^{t_1-t_0}(\gamma)$. The following theorem states the principle of least action for Nambu mechanics.

Theorem 7 *A 2-chain Γ is an extremal of the action $A(C)$ in the class of all 2-chains C whose boundaries—1-chains c_{t_0} and c_{t_1}—have the same projections onto the yz-planes as a given 1-chains γ_{t_0} and γ_{t_1}.*

Proof. As in the case of Hamiltonian mechanics, this statement follows from the previous theorem (cf. [5]).

Here is another proof, based on direct calculation. Assume that Γ admits a parametrization $x = x(s,t),\ y = y(s,t),\ z = z(s,t)$, where $0 \le s \le 1,\ t_0 \le t \le t_1$, such that it time-slices are closed curves, i.e. for all t functions x, y, z are periodic in s with period 1. Variations $\delta x,\ \delta y,\ \delta z$ satisfy conditions $\delta y(s,0) = \delta y(s,1) = \delta z(s,0) = \delta z(s,1) = 0$ for all $0 \le s \le 1$. We have explicitly

$$A(C) = \int\int_\Pi \{x(\frac{\partial y}{\partial s}\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial y}{\partial t}\frac{\partial z}{\partial s}) - H_1(\frac{\partial H_2}{\partial x}\frac{\partial x}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial y}\frac{\partial y}{\partial s} + \frac{\partial H_2}{\partial z}\frac{\partial z}{\partial s})\} ds dt,$$

where $\Pi = \{0 \le s \le 1,\ t_0 \le t \le t_1\}$. Using Stokes theorem and properties of δy and δz, we obtain the following expression for the variation of the action

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta A(\Gamma) = \int\int_\Pi \{ \quad & (\quad \{\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(y,z)}\}\frac{\partial y}{\partial s} - \{\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(z,x)}\}\frac{\partial z}{\partial s})\delta x \\
+ \quad & (\quad \{\frac{\partial x}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(y,z)}\}\frac{\partial z}{\partial s} - \{\frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(x,y)}\}\frac{\partial x}{\partial s})\delta y \\
+ \quad & (\quad \{\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(z,x)}\}\frac{\partial x}{\partial s} - \{\frac{\partial x}{\partial t} - \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(y,z)}\}\frac{\partial y}{\partial s})\delta z\} ds dt,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $\delta A(\Gamma) = 0$ for all admissible variations $\delta x,\ \delta y,\ \delta z$, if Γ consists of integral curves of Nambu-Hamilton phase flow. □

Remark 8 The converse statement is also true: extremals of action functional are "world-sheets" $x(s,t), y(s,t), z(s,t)$ consisting of families of integrals curves of Nambu-Hamilton phase flow parametrized by s. Indeed, these extrema are characterized by condition the the cross product of the following vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$

$$(\frac{\partial x}{\partial t} - \{H_1, H_2, x\}, \frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \{H_1, H_2, y\}, \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \{H_1, H_2, z\}) \text{ and } (\frac{\partial x}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial y}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial z}{\partial s})$$

is zero, which means that there exists a function $\alpha(s,t)$ such that

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial t} - \alpha(s,t)\frac{\partial x}{\partial s} \quad = \quad \frac{\partial(H_1,H_2)}{\partial(y,z)},$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial y}{\partial t} - \alpha(s,t)\frac{\partial y}{\partial s} &= \frac{\partial(H_1, H_2)}{\partial(z, x)},\\ \frac{\partial z}{\partial t} - \alpha(s,t)\frac{\partial z}{\partial s} &= \frac{\partial(H_1, H_2)}{\partial(x, y)}.\end{aligned}$$

Changing the parametrization $s \mapsto s' = s + \alpha(s,t)t,\ t \mapsto t' = t$, we see that this system reduces to the family of Nambu-Hamilton equations parametrized by s.

Remark 9 Comparison between principles of least action for Nambu and Hamiltonian mechanics shows that "configuration space" of Nambu mechanics of order 3 constitute "two-third" of a phase space.

It is straightforward to generalize presented results for the case of Nambu bracket of order n. The analog of Poincaré -Cartan integral invariant is defined as the following $n-1$-form

$$\omega^{(n-1)} = x_1 dx_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge dx_n - H_1 dH_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge dH_{n-1} \wedge dt,$$

and the action functional is given by

$$A(C_{n-1}) = \int_{C_{n-1}} \omega^{(n-1)}$$

and is defined on the $n-1$-chains in the extended phase space. In its formulation admissible variations are those which do not change projections of the boundary ∂C_{n-1} on the $x_2 x_3 \ldots x_n$-hyperplanes; in this case the "share" of "configuration space" in a phase space is $1 - 1/n$.

Remark 10 This construction of action form and action functional is somewhat similar to the construction of cyclic cocycles in Connes' approach to the non-commutative differential geometry [8].

4 Quantization

There exist several different (and, in a certain sense, equivalent) points of view on quantization problem.

One is based on the approach which uses a *deformation theory* of associative algebras. It considers quantization as a deformation of a (commutative) algebra of classical observables on the phase space in the "direction" defined by a given Poisson (or symplectic) structure [12].

Namely, let X be a Poisson manifold with the Poisson bracket $\{\ ,\ \}$ and algebra of classical observables $A = C^\infty(X)$. One-parameter family $\{A_h\}$ of associative algebras is called a *quantization* of a commutative algebra A of classical observables, if following conditions are satisfied.

1. Algebra A is included into this family

$$A_h|_{h=0} = A,$$

(or, in a formal algebraic category, $A \cong A_h/hA_h$).

2. All algebras A_h are isomorphic to A (or rather to $A[[h]]$ in formal algebraic category) as linear spaces.

3. Denoting by $*_h$ (associative) product in A_h ($*$-product in the terminology of [12]), one has the expansion

$$f_1 *_h f_2 = f_1 f_2 + \frac{h}{2} C_2(f_1, f_2) + O(h^2),$$

with the property

$$C_2(f_1, f_2) - C_2(f_2, f_1) = \{f_1, f_2\}.$$

The last property is often referred as a *correspondence principle*

$$\{f_1, f_2\} = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h}(f_1 *_h f_2 - f_2 *_h f_1)$$

between classical and quantum mechanics.

Deformation theory approach can be carried out explicitly in the case $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ (or $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$) with canonical Poisson bracket and yields celebrated *Hermann Weyl's quantization* scheme. Corresponding $*$-product $*_h$—a map from $A \otimes A$ into A, is given by a composition of a usual commutative point-wise product on A with the following bilinear pseudo-differential operator

$$\exp(\frac{h}{2}\{\ ,\ \}) = \exp(\frac{h}{2}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\}) : A \otimes A \mapsto A \otimes A.$$

One might use the same approach towards the quantization of Nambu mechanics. Namely, suppose that we try to include "usual" ternary product—a map from $A \otimes A \otimes A$ into A, given by a point-wise multiplication of classical observables, into the "new" ternary operation $(\ ,\ ,\ )_h$ which depends on parameter h and satisfies certain natural properties (analogous to associativity condition in the binary case) and a correspondence principle

$$\{f_1, f_2, f_3\} = \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathrm{Alt}(f_1, f_2, f_3)_h,$$

where Alt denotes complete anti-symmetrization with respect to the arguments f_1, f_2, f_3.

We can easily generalize Weyl's formula by letting the new ternary operation $(\ ,\ ,\ )_h$ to be the composition of a point-wise ternary product and the following trilinear pseudo-differential operator

$$\exp(\frac{h}{6}\{\ ,\ ,\ \}) = \exp(\frac{h}{6}\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\}) : A \otimes A \otimes A \mapsto A \otimes A \otimes A.$$

This formula generalizes verbatim for canonical Nambu bracket of order n.

Remark 11 One should note the following.

(i) Contrary to the usual binary case, point-wise ternary product of classical observables looks less natural.

(ii) "Natural" constraints for ternary operations generalizing usual associativity constraint are, apparently, not well understood.

Nevertheless, proposed deformation has certain "appeal" and should be analyzed further. It might lead to the (partial) answer to a problem in (ii).

Remark 12 Recently R. Lawrence [13] proposed a system of axioms for linear spaces with n-ary operations (n-algebras using her terminology). It looks that "deformed" product $(\ ,\ ,\ )_h$, as well as a ternary point-wise product, do not satisfy them. However, one should have in mind that approach in [13] generalizes certain combinatorial properties of algebraic operations (notably the Stasheff polyhedron), whereas our approach is based on "dynamics".

Another approach uses *Feynmann's path integral formulation* of quantum mechanics. For a quantum particle, described classically by a Hamiltonian system, it gives the probability amplitude of the transition from a state $|q_0\rangle$ at time $t = t_0$ into state $|q_1\rangle$ at time $t = t_1$ as a functional integral of the exponential of the classical action

$$\exp\{\frac{i}{h}A(\gamma)\}$$

over all "histories" γ with respect to the "Liouville measure"

$$\frac{i}{h}DpDq$$

in the functional space of all "histories".

Principle of the least action for Nambu mechanics can be used to formulate just similar rule. However, special form of action principle (see Theorem 7) requires that quantum states $|y(s), z(s)\rangle$ should be parametrized by loops $y(s), z(s)$ rather then by points in a

"configuration" space. This natural appearance of loops looks quite appealing. It suggests that one might still have particles as a point-like objects in classical picture and dynamic of loops (or, generally, $n-2$-closed chains) in quantum picture. We are planning to investigate this intriguing opportunity elsewhere.

Finally, we present yet another approach to quantization a *canonical formalism*. It is based on *Heisenberg commutation relations*, which for the phase space $X = \mathbb{R}^2$ with canonical Poisson bracket look the following (in a complex form)

$$[a, a^\dagger] = aa^\dagger - a^\dagger a = I,$$

where operators $a^\dagger,\ a$ act in a linear space of quantum states. They have the following realization in a space $\mathbf{H}_2$ with the basis $\{|n\rangle\}_{n\geq 0}$ parametrized by non-negative rational integers:

$$a|n\rangle = \sqrt{n}|n-1\rangle,\ a^\dagger|n\rangle = \sqrt{n+1}|n+1\rangle.$$

The vector $|0\rangle$ plays the role of a vacuum state and operators $a^\dagger,\ a$ are called creation-annihilation operators.

Being one of the fundamental principles of quantum mechanics, Heisenberg commutation relations have remarkable mathematical properties. In particular, one has celebrated Stone-von Newmann theorem that all irreducible representations of Heisenberg commutation relations are unitary equivalent. Application of Stone-von Newmann theorem to the linear canonical transformations gives a certain projective representation of the symplectic group, which was shown by André Weil [14] to play a fundamental role in the arithmetics of quadratic forms and quadratic reciprocity for number fields.

In [1] Nambu proposed the following generalization of Heisenberg commutation relation

$$[A_1, A_2, A_3] = A_1A_2A_3 - A_1A_3A_2 + A_3A_1A_2 - A_3A_2A_1 + A_2A_3A_1 - A_2A_1A_3 = cI, \quad (8)$$

where A_1, A_2, A_3 are linear operators, I is a unit operator and c is a constant. We will call (8) *Nambu-Heisenberg relation*.

Remark 13 Although Nambu-Heisenberg relation satisfies correspondence principle

$$\frac{1}{h}[\ ,\ ,\ ] \mapsto \{\ ,\ ,\ \},$$

a priori it is not clear that observables in quantum Nambu mechanics should be realized by linear operators. Therefore the form (8) might look rather *ad hoc*. It was already pointed

by Nambu [1] that, contrary to the usual commutator [,], "ternary commutator" [, ,] is not a derivation with respect to the operator product, which poses certain problems in formulating quantum dynamics (see [1] for detailed discussion). From our point of view, it looks like there are no reasons to impose such derivation property with respect to the operator product. "Triple commutator" [, ,], should be considered to define a Nambu-Lie "gebra" structure on quantum observables. Its property of being a derivation of this structure (see Definition 3) will imply consistency of quantum Nambu dynamics.

Instead of continued this discussion (which we are planning to do elsewhere), here we will only present explicit realization of Nambu-Heisenberg relation (8).

Let $\mathbf{Q}[\rho]$ be a quadratic number field with $1+\rho+\rho^2=0$, i.e.

$$\rho = \frac{-1+\sqrt{-3}}{2},$$

and let $\mathbf{Z}[\rho]$ be a ring of algebraic integers in $\mathbf{Q}[\rho]$, i.e.

$$\omega = m_1 + m_2\rho \in \mathbf{Z}[\rho],\ m_1, m_2 \in \mathbf{Z}.$$

Denote by $\mathbf{H}_3$ linear space with the basis $\{|\omega\rangle\}$ parametrized by $\mathbf{Z}[\rho]$. Direct calculation proves the following result.

Theorem 8 *Nambu-Heisenberg relation with $c = \rho - \bar{\rho} = \sqrt{-3}$ admits the following representation*

$$A_1|\omega\rangle = (\omega+1+\rho)|\omega+1\rangle,\ A_2|\omega\rangle = (\omega+\rho)|\omega+\rho\rangle,\ A_3|\omega\rangle = \omega|\omega+\rho^2\rangle$$

in the space $\mathbf{H}_3$.

The following arguments explain why such type of reprentations are possible.

Using the analogy with $n=2$ case, consider representation (8) of the form

$$A_1|\omega\rangle = f_1(\omega)|\omega+1\rangle,\ A_2|\omega\rangle = f_2(\omega)|\omega+\rho\rangle,\ A_3|\omega\rangle = f_3(\omega)|\omega+\rho^2\rangle.$$

Because of $1+\rho+\rho^2=0$, vectors $|\omega\rangle$ are eigen-vectors for all possible triple products $A_{i_1}A_{i_2}A_{i_3}$ of A_1, A_2, A_3 and Nambu-Heisenberg relation (8) reduces to functional equation for the uknowns $f_1(\omega),\ f_2(\omega),\ f_3(\omega)$. Theorem 8 exhibits one of its solutions. We can obtain other solutions using the following trick. Equation (8) is invariant under the similarity transformation

$$A_i \mapsto \tilde{A}_i = U^{-1}A_iU,\ i=1,2,3,$$

where $U : \mathbf{H}_3 \mapsto \mathbf{H}_3$ is an invertible linear operator. Choose U to be diagonal in the standard basis of $\mathbf{H}_3$, i.e.

$$U|\omega\rangle = u(\omega)|\omega\rangle,\ u(\omega) \neq 0,\ \omega \in \mathbf{Z}[\rho].$$

Then operators $\tilde{A}_i$ are represented by the same formulas as A_i's with

$$\tilde{f}_1(\omega) = u^{-1}(\omega+1)u(\omega)f_1(\omega),\ \tilde{f}_2(\omega) = u^{-1}(\omega+\rho)u(\omega)f_2(\omega),\ \tilde{f}_3(\omega) = u^{-1}(\omega+\rho)u(\omega)f_3(\omega).$$

Now assume that A_1 and A_2 commute and f_1, f_2 are non-zero for all $\omega \in \mathbf{Z}[\rho]$. Then one can choose $u(\omega)$ such that $\tilde{f}_1(\omega) = \tilde{f}_2(\omega) = 1$. Indeed, $u(\omega)$ can be found as a solution of the following compatible system (because of the commutativity of A_1 and A_2) of difference equations

$$\begin{aligned} u(\omega+1) &= f_1(\omega)u(\omega), \\ u(\omega+\rho) &= f_2(\omega)u(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

(Provided certain conditions at "infinity" for the functions f_1 and f_2 are satisfied, $u(\omega)$ can be given as semi-infinite product over the lattice $\mathbf{Z}[\rho]$.). Therefore, original functional equation for f_i's reduces to the following simple equation

$$\tilde{f}_3(\omega+1) - \tilde{f}_3(\omega) = c,$$

which can be easily solved.

"Gauging back" these solutions with $\tilde{f}_1 = \tilde{f}_2 = 1$ we obtain other solutions.

Solution presented in Theorem 8 does not belong to this class: operators A_1 and A_2 (as well as other pairs) do not commute and, since vectors $|\rho^2\rangle$, $|1+\rho^2\rangle$ and $|0\rangle$ annihilate, operators A_1, A_2 and A_3, corresponding functions f_i have zeros. This implies that in this case corresponding invertible operator U does not exist. This shows the special role played by representation in Theorem 8: although there is no vacuum vector in a conventional sence, there exists triple of vectors

$$|\rho^2\rangle,\ |1+\rho^2\rangle,\ |0\rangle$$

with "similar" properties.

Remark 14 It should be noted that this realization of Nambu-Heisenberg relation must be supplemented with the analog of Hermitian anti-involution, which is this case should be

an operation of order 3 (since we a dealing with a triple instead of a pair). We are planning to address this issue elsewhere.

Finally, consider briefly the general case of Nambu mechanics of order n. One can postulate the following form of Nambu-Heisenberg relation

$$\sum_{\sigma \in Symm(n)} (-1)^{\epsilon(\sigma)} A_{\sigma(1)} \dots A_{\sigma(n)} = cI. \tag{9}$$

Assuming that n is a prime integer greater then 2, consider representation of (9) in a linear space $\mathbf{H}_n$ with the basis $\{|\omega\rangle\}$ parametrized by algebraic integers $\mathbf{Z}[\rho]$ in the cyclotomic field of n-th root of unity, i.e. $\rho^n = 1$, or

$$1 + \rho + \ldots + \rho^{n-1} = 0.$$

Assuming that operators A_i are represented in a similar way:

$$A_i|\omega\rangle = f_i(\omega)|\omega + \rho^{i-1}\rangle,\ i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

one might try to repeat the same trick: "gauge out" the coefficients $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$. Namely, assume that f_i's are such that the following system of equations

$$u(\omega + \rho^{i-1}) = f_i(\omega)u(\omega),\ i = 1, \ldots n-1$$

is compatible and has a solution which gives rise to an invertible operator U. In this case commuting operators $\tilde{A}_i = U^{-1}A_iU$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$, will represent $n-1$ basic translations (generators) of the lattice $\mathbf{Z}[\rho]$ and, therefore. However, analyzing relation (9) for general n we see that all its terms contain at least one pair of A_i's with $i \leq n-1$ as nearest neighbors. These terms will appear twice in (9) and commutativity of $\tilde{A}_i$'s implies that they will mutually cancel each other!

This shows that in the higher order case Nambu-Heisenberg relation does not admit simple solutions with $n-1$ commuting operators A_i's. However, we suspect (and are planning to investigate it) that it has solution similar to that in Theorem 8.

5 Conclusion

Though this paper poses more questions that provides the answers, we feel that the subject of higher order algebraic operations might be relevant for future development of mathematical

structures related to physical problems. We suspect that it might clarify certain problems related to the generalizations of the integrability concept (Yang-Baxter equation, Poisson-Lie groups, quantum groups) for the higher dimensional case (Zamolodchikov's tetrahedron equations, Frenkel-Moore solutions, 2-categories). Ending on highly speculative note, one might suggest that perhaps these higher order structures can be also relevant in the arithmetics of forms of higher degrees, higher reciprocity laws in number theory, etc.

References

[1] Y. Nambu, *Generalized Hamiltonian mechanics.* Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2405-2412 (1973).

[2] F. Bayen, M. Flato, *Remarks concerning Nambu's generalized mechanics.* Phys. Rev. D **11**, 3049-3053 (1975).

[3] N. Mukunda, E. Sudarshan, *Relation between Nambu and Hamiltonian mechanics.* Phys. Rev. D **13**, 2846-2850 (1976).

[4] M. Hirayama, *Realization of Nambu mechanics: a particle interacting with $SU(2)$ monopole.* Phys. Rev. D **16**, 530-532 (1977).

[5] V. Arnol'd, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics.* GTM **60**, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg-Berlin, 1978.

[6] M. Flato, *Private communication.* (1992)

[7] F. Bayen, M. Flato, *Private communication.* (1992)

[8] A. Connes, *Non-commutative differential geometry.* Publ. Math. I.H.E.S. **62**, 257-360 (1986).

[9] S. Chakravarty, M. Ablowitz and P. Clarkson, *Reductions of the self-dual Yang-Mills fields and classical systems.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1085-1087 (1990).

[10] L. Takhtajan, *Modular forms as tau-functions for certain integrable reductions of the self-dual Yang-Mills equations.* Preprint PAM No. **121**, Univ. of Colorado at Boulder (1991).

[11] S. Chakravarty, *Private communication.* (1992).

[12] F. Bayen, M. Flato, C. Fronsdal, A. Lichnerowicz and D. Sternheimer, *Deformation theory and quantization. I-II.* Ann. Physics **110** 67-110, 111-151 (1978).

[13] R. J. Lawrence, *Algebras and triangle relations.* Harvard University preprint, 1991.

[14] A. Weil, *Sur certains groupes d'opérateurs unitaries.* Acta. Math. **111**, 143-211 (1964).